

REMARKS

Claims 1-21 are now pending in the application. Claims 2, 9, 15, and 17-21 are cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

INFORMATION DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

The Examiner has not considered information referred to in the information disclosure statements filed 6/9/05 and 9/27/05 for the reason that the statements did not include English translations for each cited foreign reference. The Applicant respectfully refers the Examiner to 37 C.F.R. 1.98(a)(3), which requires only a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood of each patent, publication, or other information listed that is not in the English language. The concise explanation was provided for references cited in both disclosure statements. Further, Applicant notes that a number of references cited in the disclosure statements were, in fact, in English.

For these reasons, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner consider the information disclosure statements of both 6/9/05 and 9/27/05.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-4, 6-8, 10-16, 18-21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Takahama et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0032478). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 1 recites a display method comprising the steps of projecting at least one moving image on at least one display area in a game board of a game machine from the

back of a panel and projecting a still image on the game board outside of the at least one display area. The method further comprises setting a position parameter that determines a position of said at least one display area, a number parameter that determines a number of said at least one display area, and a size parameter that determines a size of said at least one display area where said at least one moving image is displayed. The method further comprises changing more than one of said position parameter, said number parameter, and said size parameter at a predetermined time while the at least one moving image and the still image are displayed, and changing more than one of said position parameter, said number parameter, and said size parameter when a state of the game machine changes during a game. The at least one moving image includes a broadcast television image. Takahama et al. fails to teach or suggest the display method recited by claim 1.

Takahama et al. describes a tennis match game program. Takahama et al., Para. [0137]. Images of an opponent character and a ball character are moved over a still image of a tennis court. Takahama et al., Para. [0137]. Takahama et al., however, is silent as to changing either a number or a size parameter of a moving image. Takahama et al. is further silent as to changing more than one of a position parameter, a number parameter, and a size parameter of a moving image. Takahama et al. is likewise silent as to the at least one moving image including a broadcast television image.

Thus, Takahama et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 1. With regard to claims 3-4, Applicant notes that each either directly or indirectly depends from claim 1 which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore,

claims 3-4 also define over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 6 recites a display apparatus comprising a projection mechanism that projects an image from a back of a game board of a game machine; and a control unit. The control unit causes the projection mechanism to projection display at least one moving image on at least one display area in the game board and causes the projection mechanism to projection display a still image on the game board outside the at least one display area. The control unit also sets parameters including a position parameter that determines a position of said at least one display area, a number parameter that determines a number of said at least one display area, and a size parameter that determines a size of said at least one display area where the moving image is displayed. The control unit changes more than one of the parameters at a predetermined time, while the at least one moving image and the still image are displayed. The control unit causes the projection mechanism to project at least one of a broadcast television image and a distributed image as the at least one moving image.

Similar limitations are recited by claim 1. For at least the above reasons, Takahama et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 6. With regard to claims 7-8, and 10-13, Applicant notes that each either directly or indirectly depends from claim 6 which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, claims 7-8 and 10-13 also define over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

Claim 14 recites a display method comprising the steps of projecting at least one moving image on at least one display area of a game board of a game machine and

projecting a still image on the game board outside of the at least one display area. The display method further comprises changing at least one of a position parameter that determines a position of said at least one display area, a number parameter that determines a number of said at least one display area, and a size parameter that determines a size of said at least one display area while the at least one moving image and the still image are displayed. The predetermined time corresponds to a change in a state of a game being played on the game machine. The at least one moving image includes a broadcast television image.

Similar limitations are recited by claim 1. For at least the above reasons, Takahama et al. fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claim 14. With regard to claim 16, Applicant notes that each either directly or indirectly depends from claim 14 which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, claims 16 also define over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 5, 9, and 17 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahama et al. (U.S. Pub. 2003/0032478) in view of Wells (U.S. Pat. No. 6,846,238). The rejection is rendered moot due to cancellation with respect to claims 9 and 17. The rejection is respectfully traversed with respect to claim 5.

Applicant notes that claim 5 each depend from claims 1, which defines over the prior art as discussed above. Therefore, claim 5 also defines over the prior art. Reconsideration and withdrawal of these rejections are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Aug 2, 2006

By: 

G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GGS/BEW/MPD/cn]